

From: jared eisenmann
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/23/02 9:53am
Subject: No on settlement!

I vote NO! to the proposed Microsoft Settlement.

I don't believe that the current proposal provides adequate reparations to those injured by Microsoft's anti-competitive behavior. Hundred, even thousands, of small companies have ceased to exist over the decades because of Microsoft's business practices. The idea that a company found to be a monopoly's punishment is to spread their product to even MORE people, is absolutely ludicrous. Punish them by making them even more of a monopoly? I fail to see how giving them a larger market share is a punishment. It is a reward! The opposite would be a punishment, force Microsoft to pay for its competitors (such as Linux or Apple) to put their systems into under-privileged schools.

Similar to the settlement against AT&T, Microsoft should become a government regulated Monopoly, until its market share drops to an acceptable level (40%, for example, assuming one of it's competitors is now also at 40%). This must be true for all Microsoft product lines, before regulation is lifted.

Even after being found guilty of being an illegal monopoly, Microsoft's behavior has not changed. Regulation of their behavior, with the threat of severe criminal penalties for failure to comply, is the only remedy that I can see will curtail them. The market must be able to return to a state of competition.

Imagine the damage to the United States if Microsoft were to fail, as Enron failed. The risks of a monopoly are greater than merely the loss of competition. Are we to return to the late 19th century? Will a few men like JP Morgan and Carnegie control our destiny again? I say Nay! Capitalism is based on competition- and monopolies eliminate competition. The settlement with Microsoft is doing nothing to curtail it's monopolistic practices.

Jared Eisenmann
George Washington U.